MARYLAND

COLONIZATION JOURNAL.

CONDUCTED BY JAMES HALL, GENERAL AGENT OF THE MARYLAND STATE COLONIZATION SOCIETY.

New Series. BALTIMORE, AUGUST, 1843. Vol. 2.—No. 2.

"Nothing is more clearly written in the Book of Destiny, than the Emancipation of the Blacks; and it is equally certain that the two races will never live in a state of equal freedom under the same government. so insurmountable are the barriers which nature, habit and opinion have established between them." JEFFERSON.

GENERAL ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

We cannot omit copying the whole of the following well written article upon the World's Convention, which we find in the Colonization Herald, even at the risk of being accused of making up the whole of our present number from that excellent Journal. We think, however, that the article is too strongly anti-English, and unjustly severe in that way. In fact, the English, properly speaking, had very little to do with the Convention. It certainly must have been a pretty small affair, and but poorly supplied with *material* from the fact that two American Toadies were elevated to the rank of Vice-Presidents. Great business that—Joshua Leavitt and (somebody else, we forget who) Vice Presidents of the World's Convention, sitting in London. Not even the *one* step here, from the *sublime* to the *ridiculous*.

The sayings and doings of this body are duly recorded in "*The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Reporter*," of June 14, 21, and 28. The Convention met on the 13th of June, and only closed its sittings on the evening of the 20th. Echoing the language of the Reporter on the occasion, "That so large a body of men should be drawn together from various parts of the world by a common sympathy and a common object, is a striking fact," we would ask a question which might seem quite superfluous, if not strange,—What is the "common sympathy" and "common object?" Philanthropy? But is real love for our species compatible with an outpouring of all that can express contumely and hate for one portion of mankind, whilst professing unbounded zeal for the improvement in the condition of another portion? Well then, perhaps the unanimity of feeling and purpose is the pure and truthful and charitable spirit of Christianity! Alas! can we attribute to this spirit the repeated and utter denunciation of the churches, and of those who minister in them, the continued infractions of the law of love, the general forgetfulness on the emancipating influence of the Gospel, and the extravagance of assertion without truth, and an obvious disregard of truth, which cast such a dark shadow over the sittings of this Convention.

What then, we ask again, was the community of sympathy and object which drew together men from various parts of the world? What else was there of common sympathy, but that which is referable to personal vanity, to the petty ambition of shining, no matter with how much of *ignus fatuus*, or a lurid glare, on a new scene, and in a character above any which could be awarded them at home? And for common object, what but the aggrandisement of Great Britain? A very thin veil covers the designs of the active members both of the Anti-Slavery Convention and of the British and

Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. Every now and then, in the warmth of present and still greater anticipated success, it is partially withdrawn, so that even the uninitiated are able to see the elaborate workings of the system—as in some remarks which escaped from the Rev. W. Brock, of Norwich, at a meeting of the Society above named, on the 21st of June. This meeting may properly enough be regarded as a supplement to the Convention. Mr. Brock, after expressing his hopes that the anti-slavery conventions are not spending the strength of the people, goes on to say: "Some extraordinary statements were there made of the prosperity of the cause in the United States. In America they say, in reference to British Influence, 'that it contrives to be every where. (Cheers.) Move wherever you may, you find that the interests and the philanthropy of Britain discover themselves, and they are now setting themselves against our peculiar institution.' It is a good thing that they begin to feel this, and I think that it should encourage us to go on." What nation or community, civilized or savage, that has not discovered and felt, to its loss, the interests of Great Britain brought to bear on it. Ask the continents and the islands. Ask India in the whole and in its several kingdoms, from the time when the ruler of Bengal was betrayed by Warren Hastings, to the present day, when Afghanistan has been invaded, her rulers expelled, her fields desolated, her cities stormed and sacked. Ask China, bullied into a war to support the smuggling of a poisonous drug, her coasts ravaged, her cities only saved from destruction by heavy ransom, and she compelled at last to purchase peace at the expense of immense treasures, which must be extorted from her people by direct and heavy taxation. Ask poor bleeding Africa herself, what really recuperative energy has the British interests brought into action for the permanent amelioration of the sufferings of her children. Has any adequate atonement been offered, to this day, for the extensive slave trade so long carried on by Great Britain, and for a time monopolized by her by express treaty stipulations. Ask the United States of America, whether as British interests forced on them when in their colonial dependency, the curses of slavery and slaveholding, similar interests may not, now that their relations to each other have undergone such important and radical changes, be again at work under the garb of anti-slavery. Suspicion may well attach to those influences and that philanthropy which can, at the same time, countenance Christian missionaries in India, and make an annual allowance for the support of the idolatrous and cruel superstitions of Juggernaut, and boast of sending the Bible to Syria and Asia Minor, and yet sustain Mahomedan power and supremacy, by alliances with Turkey, and treaties with Egypt and Persia.

Which has been most predominant and most sensibly felt, British interests or British philanthropy in unhappy Ireland—in Italy, incited to rise against Napoleon under the promise of freedom, and then betrayed, without a stipulation, to the iron rule of Austria—or Spain, whose people were roused under a representative government, albeit imperfect, of Juntas and a Cortes, to aid British armies in expelling the French from the Peninsula, and then handed over without a single guaranty or even friendly advice in favor of their lately received free institutions to a weak and cruel tyrant, an imbecile nobility, and ignorant and corrupt priesthood. But we are just reminded that Mr. Borrow, an Agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society, has atoned for the omission of his government by distributing a few thousand bibles among the Spanish people. And this is the philanthropy!—as these were the interests! Which of the two have been most largely discovered and keenly felt? By a similar showing, we must suppose that the smuggling of opium to poison the Chinese, and the enforcing war that fol-

lowed, have been balanced in that quarter of the world by the missions of Messrs. Morrison, Gutzlaff and a few well educated and well meaning gentlemen.

It was probably in view of all these luminous passages of British history—and the like might be collected to form volumes—that the Rev. Amos Phelps, concluded a speech at the great meeting of the Anti-Slavery Society, by the following burst of enthusiastic admiration: "Let Great Britain then go forward, and though she may not always have been and may not now be resistless to all the nations of the earth in her commercial, her political, and her martial power, yet the day is not distant when, in her moral and religious influence for every purpose of freedom and humanity whatever, she will be resistless!" (Cheers.)

The moral and religious influence of Great Britain! Where and on whom is it displayed? In India, after a century of large intercourse, and half that period of domination! Is there the slightest engrafting of this influence on the people of that country, or of any portion of the East, so that if the instruments of her dominion, the agents of her 'interests'—her army and functionaries and the civil servants of the East India Company—were withdrawn, there would remain a city, a district, a hamlet, in the enjoyment of this influence of Great Britain. The fact is, that what has been said of the Turks: "they have been merely encamped in Europe for the last three centuries and a half," is strictly applicable to the British in India. They have been encamped in that vast and fertile country which they retain as conquerors, but without a single tie of a moral, a religious, or a politico-economical nature to secure their affection or the gratitude of the people. And how can it be otherwise, since they remain aliens to Christianity, and the better parts of English legislation and jurisprudence?

If we look at home for evidence of this moral and religious influence, we find a church establishment, from which the majority of the people are dissenters, but for the support of which they are nevertheless taxed, an establishment wholly inoperative on the masses whose ignorance and vice, constituting deplorable moral degradation, find a counterpart in their physical destitution and sufferings. There is not a branch of industry, scarcely a vocation, whether it be agriculturists, manufacturers or miners, in which the majority of both sexes and all ages are not deprived of adequate instruction, moral teaching or religious restraints, as they are of wholesome food, lodging and air, and in hundreds of places, towns and villages, and portions of large cities, even of water for the purpose of personal cleanliness. [See *Chadwick's* Report on the Sanitary Condition of the labouring population of Great Britain, referred to in a former number of the Colonization Herald, and a recent Report on the condition of the people of the Mining Districts.] What shall we say of the moral and religious influence which overlooks and neglects these manifold and pressing evils, this enslavement of mind and waste of body, in millions of her own people at home, whilst vaunting herself as the reformer and benefactor of people in remote lands.

With what grace can Britain or her people, and how dare our own citizens, while ministering to her vanity by abusing their own country, set up a claim for her interference direct or implied, govermental or *society-wise* in the operation of our Federal system. Has she manifested any peculiar dexterity—a happy union of policy and philanthropy, in her home government, to justify her interference with the domestic policy and legislation of other countries. We may fearlessly ask if she has solved a single problem in political economy, or at any period of her history reconciled or conformed with morals and religion, the conflicting interests of any two classes

of her population. Certainly we shall not be answered by reference to the revolting contrasts between her great landed aristocracy and the masses—the privileges of the former, the destitution of the latter. Chartism and Corn law agitation, announce discrepancies and inequalities little short in their worst features of those of slavery in the United States. Bunglers of the worst kind in unraveling the web of vested rights and antiquated usages, and weaving in its stead a tissue of wholesome legislation and practical economy, as witness Ireland near and India at a distance, the people of Great Britain still thrust themselves forward, as the great manufacturers of morals and laws for the rest of the world. Some of the inhabitants of the United States are silly enough to believe in these pretensions, and do their best to give them strength for working against their own country. To none does this accusation more apply than to the ultra-abolitionists, the anti-slavery and anti-churchmen and women, whose zeal outruns not only all discretion, but drives them into an oblivion of the commonest facts. Lamentable proofs to this effect are now before us in the columns of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Reporter, containing the proceedings of the General Anti-Slavery Convention. We proceed to cull some of the choicest of these flowers of American rhetoric abroad, with now and then an offering from an English hand. To make the reference more easy, we shall place them under distinct headings.

The Churches and Clergy in America.—Arnold Buffum, delegate from the Indiana State Anti-Slavery Society, and whose hats the citizens of Philadelphia, some years ago, had the privilege of purchasing, when he was a resident in this city, thus discoursed. Arnold is an ex-Friend, who has not left behind him much of the odour of sanctity, nor the reputation of being always averse to strong measures or discipline. "However, as Sir George Strickland had declared, abuses and cruelties must continue so long as slavery existed; and to destroy the great bulwark of Slavery in America, the churches must be beaten down." "In Philadelphia and elsewhere, coloured people, free coloured people, applied to chapels to be admitted to fellowship, but they were refused."

Rev. John Angel James, delegate from Birmingham, ready to echo the words of the abolitionist of sixty years, Arnold Buffum, told the Convention, that "Hitherto the American Church had been the bulwark of slavery, without its co-operation it could not have existed." Touching this assertion of the Birmingham divine, see an article in another column from the New York Observer.

Captain Charles Stuart, from the New Jersey State Anti-Slavery Society, "admitted [amiable confession] that the American churches, with few but honourable and increasing exceptions, were the great bulwarks of slavery. He grieved to add, that the bulk of the ministers were slaveholders, hence the cause of such an extraordinary and deplorable state of things. (Hear.)"

Mr. J. C. Fuller told them that "the church was the bulwark of slavery." He then went on to belabour the General Assembly; the Baptists and the Methodists, "talk to him that their churches were pure, or any thing approximating to purity! They might, to use a homely phrase, as well tell him that the moon was made of green cheese. (Hear and laughter.")

Mr. Fuller concluded his speech, one of the *notabilia* of which has already been recorded, and another yet remains to be subsequently disposed of, by this flattering sentence: "Every man who went down to the General Assembly as a minister or as an elder, every man who went to the General Conference, and recognized a man-thief, a child-stealer, and a woman-shipper, as a brother in Christ, had rallied on the question of slavery. (Cheers.)"

The colloquy which followed between Mr. Fuller and the Rev. Mr. Blanchard, delegate from the Ohio State Anti-Slavery Society, must have been highly edifying to the clerical and other soberly religious members of the Convention. We give it as we find it in the *Reporter*.

"The Rev. Mr. Blanchard related an instance of his having travelled with a Presbyterian minister, who had a slave with him, and was the owner of fifteen slaves. He, however, begged to say, that there were west of the Alleghany mountains six synods, including 130 Presbyteries, who excluded slave traders from the community. (Cheers.)

"Mr. Fuller asked, whether the General Assembly, to which the Presbyterian minister he had spoken of belonged, had not, with a full knowledge of his being a slaveholder, recognized him as a minister of Christ.

"The Rev. Mr. Blanchard was understood to say, that was the old school—that the individual had a seat there, and had moved the postponement of a memorial from a presbytery on the subject of slavery.

"Mr. Fuller would inquire, whether the new school General Assembly did not adjourn three years ago, and give the question of Anti-Slavery the 'go by;' and whether the General Assembly did not, at that time, call on the synod to rescind their resolution that kept slaveholders out of the pulpit?

"The Rev. Mr. Blanchard, (to the Convention,)—Shall I answer?

"Mr. Fuller.—I hope so.

"The Rev. Mr. Blanchard said the General Assembly did not adjourn; they sat too long, (hear,) they sat till the western delegates had all gone home. After the abolition delegates had gone away, some of the members got up, wept and blubbered, and got a vote passed to request those presbyteries who had shut out slaveholders to rescind the vote, on the ground that it was a rescinding act like that by which the old and new school had been separated. They frightened the General Assembly by declaring that those presbyteries had acted disorderly, but the presbyteries repassed their votes in more emphatic language, and sent back a severe rebuke to the Assembly. (Cheers.)"

Society of Friends.—Mr. Fuller, who, by the way, figured as general agent for the fugitive slaves in North America, and facetiously spoken of as a Yankee gentleman, but who was in fact a re-importation, being an Englishman, and a self-called Friend, thus narrates his experience: "He had seen a woman Friend, in the character of an elder, in the State of Virginia, leave her seat in the minister's gallery, go into the side gallery, and turn out a dozen coloured women that three white women might be accommodated." (Hear, hear.)

Arnold Buffum—"He had been of the Society of Friends, but he would speak the truth in this matter. In the meeting houses and schools of the Friends in Philadelphia, the coloured persons were separate from the whites."

Mr. Fuller, by way of a clincher to his tirade against the Friends, said that in the last address of the Governor of New York, that gentleman declared that had the Quakers—the Society of Friends—done their duty, had they thoroughly and throughout carried out their principles, slavery at the present moment would not exist in the United States of America. (Immense cries of "hear, hear," and cheering.)"

The Chairman, (Mr. Gurney,) in reference to the assertions of Messrs. Fuller and Buffum, said, "if any branch of their Society had refused fellowship to any one on account of colour, that was contrary to the rules of their Society, and would not be sanctioned by any of their yearly meetings. (Hear.)"

Anti-Slavery Facts!—The following statements, deliberately made in the Convention, may, by our readers and the intelligent portion of the

public generally, be denoted by some term very different from that of fact. We give a few specimens.

Rev. Joshua Leavitt, delegate from the Massachusetts Abolition Society and Maine Auxiliary Society, to whom the somewhat oblique compliment paid by Sheridan to Dundas in the House of Commons is, we fear, too applicable—that he is indebted to his imagination for his facts, and to his memory for his imagination, made the following remarkable assertion: "Since the period when the former Convention was held, [1840,] they had succeeded in the United States in separating America from slavery. The slaveholders, in order to uphold by any foul means their detestable institution, would not hesitate to plunge their country into a war. England and France, England and the United States, and the United States and Mexico, had been recently nearly embroiled in wars, arising directly or indirectly out of the existence of slavery."

Mr. Wm. Johnson, Chairman of the Committee of Vigilance of New York, said: "The whole system of partial laws and powerful prejudices, prevented the improvement and advancement of the coloured race! All these things were singularly conspicuous in New York. No white man there dared to be seen speaking to or walking with a black man. (Hear, hear.) A black man dared not to be seen sweeping the streets of New York. (Hear, hear, hear.)" If, which we greatly doubt, these assertions be accurate, we would ask how long has this state of things prevailed? Is it not part of the fruits of anti-slavery triumph, and of that removal of prejudice against colour of which every now and then abolitionists make a boast?

Mr. Lewis Tappan, in further illustration of the prejudices against colour, asserted: "With reference to the distinction made in places of worship in the United States between the white and coloured population, he observed, that if he were to take brother Pennington, (the minister of African descent who addressed the Convention on the preceding day,) into any of the churches of America, it would throw the congregation into a holy horror. (Hear, hear, laughter, and cries of shame.)"

Surely Mr. Tappan must have known better than this. Could he make no exceptions in favour even of the many churches in the United States which are alleged to have purged themselves of the sin of slavery, and of all taint of intercourse with slaveholders. If the ex-Friend Arnold, who most likely has not troubled either churches or meetings very often with his presence, except to utter or to listen to abolition harangues, had made such an unqualified assertion, we should have been less surprised.

Mr. Henry C. Howells, delegate from the coloured population of Pittsburg, in speaking of the "tremendous difficulties" that the coloured population of America had to contend with, enlightened his auditory by the assertion that "It was scarcely possible for a family who had succeeded in raising itself above the degraded condition of their people, to leave their homes, without being followed by a multitude of white persons, who were perpetually shouting 'nigger, nigger.'" Now we will venture to say that there was not a delegate from the United States in the Convention who did not know that Mr. Howells was telling a monstrous falsehood. In Philadelphia every citizen has weekly, if not daily, opportunities of seeing the very reverse of the picture fancied by this libeller; and Philadelphia has not earned the reputation of always measuring out justice to her coloured citizens. On the great thoroughfares of travel leading from this city to the north and east, both in rail road cars and on board of steamboats, coloured persons of both sexes are met with, who take their seats without any line or barrier of separation or exclusion from their white fellow travellers. It is but a few weeks since, that, on a Sunday, two of our steamboats, belong-

ing, be it said, also, to different and rival companies, left the wharf at Philadelphia for an excursion to Bristol and Burlington. On board of one, the great majority of the passengers consisted of coloured persons; on the other, and the larger boat, the proportion of blacks and whites was about equal. The blacks distributed themselves over the deck, back to the very stern, taking, without let or molestation, the choice seats. Their deportment was quiet and correct. There was no abolition ranter to trumpet forth their abstract rights, and create a riot, nor any of their number who, by insolent demeanor or address, invited retort and aggression from whites of his own calibre. And thus would it always be, if the vulgar passions of the ignorant whites were not inflamed by the noisy and ill-timed, because speculative, declamations of abolition ranters, who, in order to acquire a little notoriety, set themselves up for being the exclusive friends of the coloured people.

For fear the picture of the United States should not be shaded sufficiently dark to suit the tastes of the Convention, Mr. Fuller gave an additional touch, by assuring them "There were only four States in the whole Union in which there were not slaves, and he took it for granted that where slaves existed, slavery was allowed by law."

We shall conclude our selections for the present, by the following delicate compliment to Philadelphia, paid by this Mr. J. Canning Fuller, of whom such honourable mention has been made already. "The people of Philadelphia, who were held up to the admiration of the friends of abolition, gave the right hand of fellowship to adulterers, robbers, and the perpetrators of every crime under the sun. (Hear, hear.") Some persons have inquired where the speaker derived his knowledge of some at least of these crimes. Was his hand ever extended to grasp that of a robber?

It would be more correct, in place of calling the Convention a General Anti-Slavery Convention, to designate it as a meeting held for the personal glorification of a certain number of American delegates, and the abuse of the government, churches and entire social organization of the people of the United States. A British convention was made the depository of American grievances, the umpire and arbitrator in American difficulties, the expurgator of American sins for those who shall be obedient to British biddings, and a rod to chastise those who still adhere to their nationality, and insist on reforming abuses after their own fashion, and at times of their own choosing. If this be an exaggerated view, let it at least be taken in connexion with the eulogies lavished on British power and British philanthropy in the Convention, and the following significant hint for future action, by Mr. Howells,—"He expressed his conviction, that if the people of England so willed it, this country could, in two or three years, put an end to slavery in America."

There are yet other points of general, and especially American interest, discussed in the General Anti-Slavery Convention, which we must take up at another time. The legislative and diplomatic revelations of the Rev. Joshua Leavitt, and the exposition of international law by the Hon. Dr. Lushington, will then find a place in our columns. In this connexion will come up the acknowledgments of some of the English members of the Convention, relating to Sierra Leone, the African Civilization Society, African Emigration to the West Indies, &c.

We wish those who are disposed to turn a cold shoulder to the colonization cause from its *alleged* unfavorable influence upon missionary operations in Africa, would just read the following article from the pen of Mr. Pinney; and at the same time bear in mind who this same Mr. Pinney is. Let them recollect that he is a clergyman of the Presbyterian Church, that he visited Africa in 1832 as a missionary of the "Western Board," (we think it is called,) that he the following year received the appointment of Governor of the Colony of Liberia, and that a few years subsequently he again went out as agent of the Western Board and selected a spot for the establishment of a mission of that Board in the Kroo country.

Added to the opportunities Mr. Pinney has enjoyed for acquiring information with regard to the colony, the natives, the operations of the missionaries, and their mutual action upon each other, Mr. P. possesses a peculiarly investigating mind, and an inquisitiveness which it is not always agreeable to encounter or easy to satisfy. He may be said therefore to be master of the whole subject, and if he would be influenced or swayed by associations or predilections, it certainly would not be in favour of the colonists, for we have often had occasion to remark that he is the only white man whom we have ever known to suffer unkindness or injury at the hands of the colonists, as a people, and that, not when he was a missionary of the cross, but Governor of the Colony and Agent of the Colonization Society.

Mr. Pinney has not taken ground in favour of the Maryland State Colonization Society, in the questions which have arisen between it and the American Board, and we do not ask him to; but he has taken ground against INFALLIBILITY—either in the man of Rome or the young men who go to Africa as missionaries. Let but the Missionary Boards take the same grounds—give ear to FACTS and INVESTIGATE—and we shall have no trouble to apprehend.

(From the Colonization Herald.)

THE COLONIZATION CIRCULAR—WITHDRAWAL OF MISSIONS.

Under this head, a writer in the *Northern Advocate*, June 29, who signs himself "CONSISTENCY," has written something hard to be understood, and *insinuated* many things adverse to the COLONIZATION ENTERPRISE. It is easy in one sentence for a writer to make assertions, or throw out surmises, or ask questions—which to answer fully, might require a volume. This is true, whether the writer is an infidel who would covertly attack christianity, or an opponent of a benevolent scheme. But such questions, however confidently asked, are not arguments; and when directed against truth, are usually the resort of the weak or cowardly. This being premised, I will, as briefly as possible, review the article of "Consistency." The first paragraph simply asserts a fact entirely true, and requires no remark except to suggest that the last sentence seems incomplete.

The second paragraph purports to give the ground of the appeal to the benevolence of the religious public contained in the circular. The writer has given only a portion of the arguments going to enforce this appeal—and his summary is defective.

As, however, he has selected a prominent argument, I am willing in this review to omit the considerations in favour of colonization, which are urged from its influence, in civilizing and enlightening the African tribes—

in raising up an effectual barrier to the slave trade—in lessening the motives to war among the tribes—in securing peace and tranquillity among them, and at the same time introducing a commerce, natural, lawful and beneficial; and again from its influence upon the coloured emigrant and his race, in the moral effects likely to arise from a successful experiment, which affords to the coloured man a free republican government under which to develope his utmost capabilities, and manifest his fitness for something higher than he can at present enjoy in America. These, however, are grounds of "*the appeal*," and deserved some notice from "CONSISTENCY."

In his third paragraph, "Consistency," has so mingled admissions, restrictions, questions and assertions, as to render a review difficult without subdividing it, which I shall take the liberty of doing.

The first section of the paragraph is an admission that there is an *undoubted* and "*natural*" influence in the civilization of savages which colonization effects, necessarily opening the way for the prosecution of christian missions. But "Consistency" thinks this "natural" influence is too strongly urged in the Circular. I differ from him, and think in the present condition of Africa, this incidental advantage can scarcely be over estimated. The well known fact that hitherto all successful and permanent missions in Africa, have been planted within Colonies, or so near as to receive from them countenance and influence, is in proof on this point. Will "Consistency" please consider this fact.

Mingled with this admission, "Consistency" intimates several drawbacks and doubts. He says, "if the Colonization scheme gave this incidental aid—threw no obstacles in the way of missionaries—or manifests no disposition to do so, I would admit that this incidental aid gave *some* claim to patronage." Here appears to be a singular personification. "The Colonization scheme" is represented as having *a disposition* to throw obstacles in the way of missionaries.

How can *a scheme* be properly said to have any *disposition?* If "Consistency" means that the members of the Colonization Society have a disposition to "throw obstacles," &c., whom does he accuse? The principal members of the Methodist, Presbyterian, Episcopal and other churches? And can any one believe that these men, many of whom are prominent members of Missionary Societies, would patronize and manage a cause so hostile to missions? I do not.

By throwing "*obstacles*" *in the way* of the missionary, the common reader would understand hindering a missionary from his proper work of teaching the heathen; and accordingly, "Consistency," afterwards says, "an impression has gone abroad, that if it (Colonization) is not inimicable to missionary operations, it has at least embarrassed them;" and again, "if Colonization has embarrassed unnecessarily the missionary operations." I will remark, that every hindrance to the operations of a missionary is not "unnecessary." It depends upon the character of those operations, and the spirit and temper with which they are conducted. If a missionary in any country intermeddles with political government—if he mingles in and inflames the bitterness of party strife—if he attempts to resist the regular operations of law—or even in his proper sphere he is litigious, supercilious, domineering, ready to provoke and slow to peace—it might be the duty of the Colonization Society, or any other having authority for the sake of proper missionary operations, to throw obstacles in the way of SUCH missionaries.

"Consistency" does well, therefore, to place his doubts upon the case of "unnecessary" embarrassment.

I regret that in determining this really important question, "Consistency" should have suppressed "several facts" which he thinks "ought to be known," and confined himself to "one or two inquiries." Facts, when stated, are tangible, and are often capable of satisfactory explanation. Inquiries are more vague and capable of conveying a false insinuation, and misleading the judgment. They leave the fancy of the reader room to imagine many things wholly untrue, and yet incapable of being reached by a reply.

Had "Consistency" given us his *facts* instead of inquiries, we might have denied and asked proof, or admitting these, shew their bearing to be different from the one he suggests.

Let us proceed, however, to the question.

1. "Do not the A. B. C. F. M. find it necessary to direct the withdrawal of their Missionaries from the whole of that part of Africa called Liberia—and if so, how does this comport with the assertion that Colonization aids the Missionary in his work?"

This inquiry is first as to an act of the A. B. C. F. M., and assuming an affirmative reply—secondly, as to its consistency with the assertion that Colonization aids the Missionary in his work? First, I reply as to the act. The A. B. C. F. M. did in 1842, direct their Missionaries to leave Cape Palmas, the Maryland Colony, and go to the Gaboon. But this is a very different act from the one implied in the inquiry of "Consistency." His inquiry is as to an act extending to the *whole* of Liberia. Their act was as to a single settlement founded by the State of Maryland, which had not even a distant connection with that portion of Liberia, with which the New York and Pennsylvania and American Colonization Societies are connected. Even were it admitted that a policy existed in the Maryland Colony hurtful to Missions, it would not be just, as "Consistency" has chosen, by implication to condemn other Colonies where no such policy existed.

"Consistency" enquires, "did they not find it necessary to direct the withdrawal of their Missionaries from the WHOLE of that part of Africa called Liberia?" Answer, No! That Board never had Missions in the whole of Liberia. He then perhaps enquires, did they not find it necessary to direct their withdrawal from the Maryland Colony? Answer, they did so direct, but whether it was a necessity originating in the improper policy of the Maryland Colonization Society, or in the improper claims of their Missionaries, they have not to my knowledge ever informed the public. If "Consistency" knows the real cause or causes, and these constitute "*the facts*" which he says "*ought to be known*," I agree with him, and for one, will thank him to inform us. But when he speaks, let him do it from knowledge, and not from rumor or surmise.

I have heard various versions of the matter, which have left my mind in uncertainty whose the fault was which rendered the act of withdrawing the Missionaries from Cape Palmas, expedient or necessary.—"Consistency" says, "I could point to several scores of Ministers who, a short time since, were the firm friends of Colonization, who at present will not take up collections in behalf of Colonization on the Sabbath preceding the 4th July. Had I his ear, I would ask "Consistency" how many of these scores of firm friends took up 4th of July collections last year or year before, or indeed ever? How much money, if they never have taken up any collections, will the Society lose by their present resolves; and again, have these Ministers acted wisely, having been "*firm friends*," so suddenly and with so little knowledge of the reasons of that act of the A. B. C. F. M., to abandon their friendship. Methinks "firm friends" are accustomed to inquire into the truth of rumors before giving them credit, and not from suspicion change

their mind, and least of all include in their judgment the innocent with the guilty.

In his second inquiry, "Consistency" refers to the past and present conduct of a Newspaper in Liberia, which he admits is a private concern, but for which he holds the "Colonization scheme" responsible, because some Colonization Agents correspond with the Editor, and act for his paper. What sort of a Governor or Government would "Consistency" have? It must, one would judge, to suit him, have inquisitorial powers, and a strict censorship of the press. Without such powers it would be the highest injustice to hold a Government responsible for the editorials of an independent press, or the *private acts* of its Agents.

Who would not repel as odious and unjust an attempt of the government of Great Britain to hold the government of the United States accountable for the newspaper attacks upon its Monarch or Officer, who should patronize such a press, or correspond with its Editor, or join a Repeal Association? And is it not equally unjust for consistency to hold the "*Colonization Scheme*" accountable for the editorials of the independent press of Liberia? or for the private correspondence of Colonization officers or agents, either in Africa or in the United States?

How would "Consistency" approve of his argument reversed. Gov. Buchanan, Mr. Teage, and others in Liberia, complain that the "Luminary" or M. E. M. paper, contains gross slanders upon them; shall we hold that the M. Church in America, whose Agents did those acts, is to be considered guilty of assailing private character, and inimical to Colonization? Surely he would object to it as an unjust conclusion.

But as I find that this article has already passed the limits to which I intended to restrict it, I must postpone for the present further observations on this subject, which, in self-defence, I here feel myself called upon to make.

J. B. Pinney.

A NEW VERSION OF THE "MASSACRE OF THE CREW OF THE EDWARD BURLEY."

We find the following statement respecting this matter in the last number of the African Repository, and earnestly hope that it may find its way into the daily prints of the country. From information received by some colonists who come home as seamen in the Edward Burley, and who are now in this city waiting a passage out, we have no doubt but the account given by Governor Roberts is correct.

The idea that it was a "settled plan to murder the crew, and take possession" of an American vessel in sight of an American colony, by a people whose town is in reach of the guns of the colonists is too ridiculous; and then the statement too, that the transaction took place "near where the Mary Carver, of Plymouth, was cut off" is entirely incorrect. It is nearly two hundred miles distant, and the tribes are not even known to each other, as no "Fishmen" have towns to the leeward of Cape Palmas.

The statement that "the natives are said to be a fierce cannibal race" is all *gammon*. They have lived in peace and free intercourse with the colonists almost in the same town for eight years, and we never before heard of "*cannibalism*."

But as Governor Roberts says, how is Captain Burke to account for the men he has left?

The Salem Register contains the following account of the murder by the natives on the coast of Africa, of the mate and cook of the schooner Edward Burley, Captain Burke, which arrived at Beverly on Saturday last from Cape Mount:—*New York Observer.*

"It appears that on the 24th of March last, while the schooner was lying at a place called Blue Barre, nearly ready to sail, the mate, Mr. Henry G. Glading, of Salem, and John Freeman, the cook, went ashore in the boat to settle up the business, obtain some articles which had been purchased and paid for, and leave some of the Kroomen who had been employed on board. When they landed, Glading and Freeman were seized by the natives, and the latter was probably killed the same evening, but by the intervention of a friendly Krooman, Glading was taken to a settlement of American negroes near, and the next morning started in the boat for the schooner which lay about two miles from the shore, but was captured by a war canoe and ran high and dry upon the beach. The boat was afterwards taken off and overset, but whether Glading was drowned then or massacred on shore is not certainly known. Capt. Burke remained anxiously waiting for the return of his men, ignorant of the cause of the detention and their fate until he was informed by a Krooman who came off in a canoe and delivered a letter from the Governor, stating that the men were massacred.

"It afterwards appeared probable, from information received, that there was a settled plan among the natives to murder the crew, and take possession of the schooner, which might easily have been done. Freeman was a native of Accra, but had long sailed from Salem in that trade, and had a good acquaintance with several languages spoken on the coast.

"On the 2d of May, Capt. Burke fell in with the U. S. brig Porpoise, and communicated the circumstances to her commander, who promised to look into the matter. The place where this affair happened is near where the 'Mary Carver,' of Plymouth, was cut off, and her crew massacred two or three years since. The natives are said to be a fierce, cannibal-like race, and well fitted for treachery of this kind. The African squadron must keep a sharp look out upon these fellows."

The preceding statement appears in many of the papers. We have the following letter from Governor Roberts, which doubtless refers to the same case, and gives to it somewhat of a different aspect. The fact that several hundred slaves were recently taken from New Cesters, should stimulate the friends of the American Colonization Society to instant and strenuous efforts to obtain the means demanded to bring the entire line of coast from Cape Mount to Cape Palmas under the government of the colony.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE, MONROVIA,
April 25, 1843.

SIR: Notwithstanding it is altogether doubtful whether this will ever reach you, as Captain ——— is undecided what course he will steer after leaving the Gallinas; for which place he sails to-day, where I am told he expects to sell his vessel. He however informs me that he shall go from thence direct to the United States.

Captain ———'s movements on the coast have been very strange, and by some held suspicious. After getting his mate and one of the crew (the cook,) murdered by the Fishmen near Blue Barre—and but for the American settlement at Sinou, in all probability had lost his own life—he now leaves two of his men (one a native from the leeward coast) badly wounded at Sinou without the least provision for their maintenance, except an old boat and canoe that the settlers recovered from the natives, which I shall order to be sold for their benefit.

The particulars of this fracas are as follows: Some five or six months ago Captain ——— on his passage down the coast advanced to one Jack Dandy, (a Fishman,) who was employed on board his vessel as trademan. Jack after getting the tobacco, some 10 or 15 lbs., ran off. Capt. ——— when on his return, called at Sinou, and after two or three days, having nearly closed his business, incautiously remarked to some that he did not intend to pay the Fishmen employed in his boats, unless they would deliver to him Jack Dandy. His boatmen hearing this, determined to seize, and hold the boats, until they got their pay. On application to the authorities, at Greenville, the boats were recovered and delivered to Capt. ———, who, to avenge himself, after reaching his vessel dispatched a boat and a large canoe in command of his mate to cut off a number of Fishmen in canoes returning from sea. The canoes were attacked, when immediately several larger canoes with Fishmen from Blue Barre and Sinou pushed to their assistance—and in turn attacked the boats, killing two men and dangerously wounding two others. The Americans, immediately on the landing of the Fishmen, succeeded in recovering the boat and canoe with the prisoners, and took them to the settlement.

They immediately informed Capt. ——— of all that had occurred, who as soon as he got this information made sail and stood to sea.

Here, sir, you have all the particulars of this affair. What kind of a story Capt. ——— will make of it, or how he expects to account for the men he has left I cannot conceive.

The following extract from a letter from a Liberia colonist will be read with interest. It is dated at White Plains on the St. Paul's River, some fifteen miles above Monrovia.

I am astonished that the colored people of the States who consider themselves oppressed, do not turn their attention to Africa, especially those who have the means of conveyance, without the aid of the Society. No man can be disappointed, in my opinion, who will come to Africa at the present, for the purpose of enjoying religious and civil liberty, who seeks it in a proper spirit. I am truly sorry that so much ignorance still prevails among my brethren in the States in reference to Africa. But as I believe it is a voluntary ignorance, I do not know how or when it will be cured; but I am certain of one thing, that here is the colored man's home, here is his country, and, in my opinion, here he ought to be, and here he must be, to enjoy the privileges of free men, or be ever deprived of enjoying it. However, I have not time in this communication to carry out my views here on this subject. There is one thing I must notice before I close by the way of showing what we yet stand in need of. The colony requires aid from some source to protect her commerce and also to give encouragement to internal improvements; we have no men of capital sufficient to give employment to the laboring class of our community which forms a very large majority; therefore they all become petty traders, and thereby hinder proper improvements that are more desirable. We are in hopes, however, that the United States will aid in this great and good work, from all we have understood, which is very desirable. I am in hopes of visiting the States next year, and if permitted to do so, I hope I shall see you face to face and have a better opportunity of conversing on these subjects, as I now have to write in great haste from a press of business.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

I must now conclude by praying that God may greatly aid you in your

arduous labors to promote the cause of African colonization, which I believe to be the cause of God; and though it has been and yet may be hindered for a season, yet it must and will prosper, because it is of God. I now present my thanks to you for the several presents I have received from you, from time to time. I have very recently lost my eldest daughter; she had been married a little more than twelve months, and was doing well as to the affairs of this world—that is, she was comfortably situated—but was suddenly called from works to her reward. She had embraced religion more than six years, and lived a very pious life; and though the affliction was unexpected and very sore, yet we rejoice to know our loss is her infinite gain; so we have to say 'the Lord gave and the Lord taketh away; blessed be the name of the Lord.' We still crave an interest in your prayers, for the common cause of our Lord and Master.

I remain yours, with much respect,

To the Rev. R. R. GURLEY. BEVERLY R. WILSON.

The African Repository for August contains, besides the letters of Gov. Roberts and Rev. B. R. Wilson, which we have inserted, many articles of interest.

A letter from George F. Seymour, apparently a new emigrant, who is as usual delighted with the country and people. Also one from our old friend Judge Benedict, who speaks a little more like an old stager—like "one that has had losses," and complains of hard times, as folks do in this land of plenty.

A just tribute is paid to the memory of the Rev. Dr. Proudfit, the late Secretary of the New York Colonization Society. What the standing of Dr. Proudfit was as a divine we know not, but as a colonizationist, we have the greatest reason to honour and respect his memory, for as Mahomet said of his wife Cadijah, "By Allah, there never was a better, he believed when all else forsook" us. Although a member of the American Board of Commissioners, he openly and frankly repudiated their notoriously incorrect Report, and pronounced it a document unworthy of the Body from which it emanated and of the high name which sanctioned it. Had all the clergy stood forth like Dr. Proudfit, we should at this time see three hundred miles extent of the African coast line dotted with villages, and one hundred thousand free Liberians operating upon that vast and productive continent—a living monument which would give to this age and century its most distinguishing characteristic. But 'tis not so, proselytism, abolitionism, Puseyism, and anti-Puseyism are of more consequence than the redemption of a race and the renovation of a continent.

A cheering view is given of a mission in Fernando Po. This site will do as there is a thriving English settlement of coloured people there, which must necessarily increase, as that place forms the depot for the exports from the delta of the Niger.

A letter is introduced into the Repository, purporting to come from an "intelligent American to a respected friend in Washington," of which the following is an extract, (of which, by the way, so far as it relates to *stealing*, *binding* and *stowing away*,) we do not believe one word.

"There is an experiment making here now, that is not generally known; or at least I had not read or heard of it until my arrival. The planters of this island, for the purpose of compelling the black population to work for such compensation as will enable them to make desirable profits on sugar, have formed themselves into a company, with the countenance of the British government, for the purpose of bringing African emigrants here to compete with the natives; and so anxious and determined are they for the accomplishment of their object, that they have vessels fitted out after the fashion of *slave ships;* and not being able to get voluntary emigrants in numbers sufficient, the captain and crew are authorized, and do steal them on the coast, and in violation of their wishes, bring them here bound and stowed away, to prevent damage. And this is known and conversed about here, with as much certainty as we speak in Ohio, of the existence of a society, many of the members of which assist blacks in their flight from their masters in the neighbouring States. Indeed, I know some of these emigrants who have so learned the English language as to be able to tell their tales with tears in their eyes. The difference between these and the voluntary emigrants is, that the former are *young* men and women; and the latter compose families and kindred connexions. It was a matter that did not rightly accord with my idea of humanity; and to be countenanced by a government that makes so many professions on the subject of oppression, &c.—and supposing that it was not generally known, it occurred to me that it might be news, of which, I have but little to communicate of any interest, and I have accordingly detailed it to you."

An article follows giving a brief view of the prosperous condition of Hayti.

Then a treaty between Governor Roberts and the head kings of the Golah Country, offensive and defensive, stipulating the abolition of the slave trade, trial by *saucy wood, &c. We hope our missionary friends will not consider this treaty *injurious* to *the natives.*

Two articles follow upon the "Movements of the Abolitionists," and "Chaos of Opinions," which it would hardly be worth while to copy even if we could, their movements are so rapid and zig zag and their chaos so profound. But there is good to come out of it all yet, there must be substance where there is so much fermentation. If we could only get rid of the *soi disant* Howards and Wilberforces of these times, all would come right. We trust they may soon wear each other out by friction.

* *Saucy* wood, not sassy, as the word is frequently spelt. Sassy not being a native word, but their manner of pronouncing the word saucy, which is synonymous with quarrelsome or venomous. A serpent may be sassy or not so. They say the boa constrictor *no be sassy.* That is, his bite is not venomous.

FALL EXPEDITION.

Our Annual Expedition will sail from this port on the first day of November next. Some sixty Emigrants are already engaged. Others can be taken if application is made previous to the 15th of October, but not after.

JAMES HALL, *General Agent.*

COLONIZATION ROOMS, *Baltimore, August 20th,* 1843.

(From the Colonization Herald.)

LIBERIAN POETRY.

The following Ode for the celebration of the last anniversary of the deliverance of the Infant African Colony from imminent peril in the attack on it by numerous barbarian hordes on the 1st December, 1822, was written by H. Teage, a colonist.—*Mr. Teage is editor of the Liberia Herald.*

FROM THE LIBERIA HERALD.

Land of the mighty Dead!
Here science once display'd,
And Art, their charms;
Here awful Pharoahs sway'd
Great nations who obeyed;
Here distant monarchs laid
Their vanquish'd arms.

They hold us in survey—
They cheer us on our way—
They loud proclaim,
From pyramidal hall—
From Carnac's sculptur'd wall—
From Thebes they loudly call—
"Retake your fame!"

"All hail Liberia! Hail!
Arise and now prevail
O'er all thy foes;
In truth and righteousness—
In all the arts of peace—
Advance, and still increase,
Though hosts oppose."

At the loud call we rise
And press towards the prize,
In glory's race:
All redolent of fame,
The land to which we came,
We'll breathe the inspiring flame,
And onward press.

Here Liberty shall dwell,
Here Justice shall prevail;
Religion here:
To this fair Virtue's dome
Meek Innocence may come,
And find a peaceful home,
And know no fear.

Oppression's cursed yoke,
By freemen shall be broke—
In dust be laid:
The soul erect and free,
Here evermore shall be;
To none we'll bend the knee
But nature's God.

Proud Science here shall rear
Her monuments, to bear
With deathless tongue:
By nations yet unborn
Her glories shall be known,
And Art her tribute join,
The praise prolong.

Commerce shall lift her head,
T' auspicious gales shall spread,
Expanded wing;
From India's spicy land,
From Europe's rock-bound strand,
From Peru's golden sand
Her tribute bring.

Oh Lord! we look to Thee—
To Thee for help we flee.
Lord, hear our prayer!
In righteousness arise,
Scatter our enemies,
Their hellish plots surprise
And drive them far.

O happy people they,
Who Israel's God obey,
Whose Lord is God:
They shall be blest indeed,
From anxious cares be freed,
And for them is decreed
A large reward.

Monrovia, Dec. 1, 1842.

☞ All Communications intended for the Maryland Colonization Journal, or on business of the Society, should be addressed to Dr. James Hall, General Agent, Colonization Rooms, Post Office Building.

Printed by John D. Toy, corner of St. Paul and Market streets, Baltimore.